

REMARKS

Claims 20-39 are now pending in the application. Claims 20-39 stand rejected. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 20-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huff et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,408,391, hereinafter "Huff") in view of Monroe (U.S. Pat. No. 6,392,692, hereinafter "Monroe"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant notes that independent Claims 20, 28 and 34 have each been amended to recite "an intrusion detection system onboard the mobile platform ..." and independent Claim 38 recites "using a security management system onboard the mobile platform" In addition, Claim 28 has also been amended to include:

wherein:

the action can be directed to at least a selected one of a plurality of user access points on the onboard network;

if an update to the set of policies is necessary, the policies are updated during the time that the intermittent link has connection with the terrestrial-based system; and

the onboard security manager maintains an indicator of a current operational state of each one of the plurality of network user access points of the onboard network, wherein the indicator indicates whether at least one of the following conditions is present:

a normal state of operational for the onboard network;

a suspect operational state wherein an intrusion event is suspected; and

a disconnect state in which access by a user of a specific one of the user access points is being prevented.

Applicant respectfully asserts that these features as claimed are not taught nor suggested by either Huff or Monroe, alone or in combination.

At best, Huff appears to disclose a system for monitoring either authorized or unauthorized users on a computer network (see at least Column 3, Lines 6-12). Huff does not appear to disclose whatsoever “an onboard network accessible to a plurality of users,” as claimed in Applicant’s invention. Rather, Huff appears to disclose a truck 700 with a security server 500, which can communicate with three other peer-to-peer links, 720, 730 and 740, each of which contains multiple vehicles with one of the multiple vehicles serving as a hub (see at least Column 13, Lines 47-67 and Column 14, Lines 4-11). Each of the peer-to-peer links 720, 730 and 740 in Huff includes one computer disposed on each of the vehicles, and the security servers 500, 600 each disposed on a wholly separate vehicle to monitor each computer disposed on each vehicle in the peer-to-peer links, 720, 730, 740. Huff further discloses the desirability of separate vehicles so that the destruction of one vehicle will not alter the security system 500, 600 or the other computers on each of the vehicles that form the peer-to-peer links (see at least Column 14, Lines 25-39). Thus, Huff only appears to teach the desirability of a security system disposed externally to the onboard network, and further teaches away from providing both a security system and a plurality of network access points for users on the same mobile platform.

Applicant notes that our invention as claimed does not suffer from the potential drawbacks of Huff because our server(s) are on the same mobile platform as all the

network access points we are monitoring. With Huff, since the important servers are on separate mobile platforms from the access points they are monitoring, a loss of communication link with any of the individual trucks can destroy the effectiveness of the whole monitoring system. Since our servers are on the same mobile platform with the access points they are monitoring, we are not susceptible to this potential "breakdown" in security from which the Huff system would appear to suffer. In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that Huff does not disclose whatsoever the use of an indicator to indicate various states of the security of the onboard network as claimed.

Applicant further submits that Monroe does not remedy the shortcomings of Huff. Monroe appears merely to disclose an electronic surveillance system which "provides both visual and/or audio information as well as critical data such as location, direction, intrusion, fire and/or smoke detection...." Monroe is silent to an intrusion detection system "onboard the mobile platform." Rather, the primary purpose of Monroe would appear to be for monitoring the mobile platform "while in port or terminal and/or unattended whether taxing or parked or docked [and] permits tracking en route" (see at least Column 1, Lines 30-31). Thus, Monroe provides for monitoring of the mobile platform itself while the mobile platform is in port and does not disclose or suggest whatsoever an intrusion detection system onboard the mobile platform as claimed. Rather, Monroe appears to merely disclose notifying "selected personnel" of a security situation on the mobile platform (see at least Column 7, Lines 59-60). Thus, Applicant respectfully submits Monroe does not remedy the shortcomings of Huff and fails to teach or suggest Applicant's invention as claimed.

As neither Huff nor Monroe teach or suggest Applicant's invention as claimed,


Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 20, 28, 34 and 38 are patentable and in condition for allowance for at least these reasons. In addition, as Claims 21-27, 29-33, 35-37 and 39 each depend from independent Claims 20, 28, 34 and 38, respectively, these claims are also believed to be patentable and in condition for allowance. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/28/05

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686
Erica K. Schaefer, Reg. No. 55,861

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
MDE/EKS/ps/lf-s

G:\eschaefer\7784\000100-199\000188\Amendment in response to OA mailed 08.26.05\Amendment.doc